DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 283 UD 017 481

AUTHOR Rittenmeyer, Dennis C.; Heinen, James R.K.
TITLE The Preparation of Urban Educators: A Survey of Urban School Systems.
SPONS AGENCY Old Dominion Univ. Research Foundation, Norfolk, Va.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented to the Second Annual Urban Education Conference (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Pluralism; Drug Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Public Schools; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; *Urban Education; *Urban Schools; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Multicultural Education

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the issue of teacher training for urban schools. Certification requirements for most public school teachers are mandated by the individual States. Requirements relevant to particular geographical areas are not typically included in State certification regulations. However, unique characteristics of urban schools have begun to be emphasized by educators concerned with appropriate professional preparation. Among these characteristics are racial, ethnic and economic heterogeneity, as well as a confluence of subcultures with concomitant attitudes and values. In 1976, a questionnaire was sent to superintendents of 157 city school districts. The 97 respondents answered questions relating to: requirements or recommendations that their teachers take courses specifically relevant to the urban educational environment, either as a pre-requisite to hiring or as a condition for staying on in the system; requirements that new teachers have student teaching or practicum experience in city or multiracial classrooms; and the provision of in-service training for urban teachers by the districts themselves. The questionnaire also addressed other special concerns of urban teachers and solicited recommendations as to ways of improving their training. (Author/GC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146283

THE PREPARATION OF URBAN EDUCATORS: A SURVEY OF URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Dennis C. Rittenmeyer
James R. K. Heinen

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

Paper Presented to the Second Annual Urban Education Conference

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
November 1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dennis C. Rittenmeyer
& James R.K. Heinen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE017481

Funds for this research made possible by a Grant from the ODU Research Foundation

THE PREPARATION OF URBAN EDUCATORS: A SURVEY OF URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Dennis C. Rittenmeyer James R. K. Heinen
Old Dominion University

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The preparation of teachers to work within the urban environment is one of the most crucial questions in American education. Every major United States city in the last few years has confronted the issue of the quality of urban education. Factors such as funding, physical facilities, teacher qualifications, multicultural students, and busing have all been major issues affecting the contemporary urban school system's search for quality urban education. That educators adopt a Deweyian posture in defining the problems of the urban school as a reflection of the problems of society itself has been of little help. The fact remains that the schools exist to serve the educational needs of their communities. To serve those needs, the personnel staffing of the urban school should reflect highly trained professionals.

A recent ERIC search, utilizing the descriptors Urban Education and the Preparation of Urban Teachers, produced no less than 350 different articles and research projects since 1960. All of these projects and articles spoke to the kinds of programs that should exist to train teachers to work in the urban school system. These included increased field experience, courses in racial and ethnic history, and courses on the city itself. Other projects and article suggest urban teachers cannot be trained on the job with in-service programs. While there is a wealth of valuable information contained in these materials, there appears to be little information which clearly suggests the means to alleviate the problems of the urban educational enterprise. Certainly, no one

has essayed a singular and definitive answer to the preparation of urban teachers.

While many university professors and curriculum specialists confidently propose an effective anatomy of appropriate training for urban educators, none appear to have advanced their dicta on the basis of sound empirical investigations into the needs of urban education school systems. Any effort at achieving ecological validity, therefore, has simply not been realized.

The city of Washington, D. C., on the other hand, requires that every teacher employed within the Washington school system have a course in multicultural education. They have made a decision as to the kinds of experiences which are important for their teachers to undergo and will not employ an applicant who does not reflect these experiences. It seems logical to assume, then, that the Washington requirement may have been replicated in other cities across the United States. The assumption is that the urban school systems knows what it wants in its professional staff and has made decisions according

The task of the present paper is to delineate those needs with a view toward bringing them into sharper relief.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Certification standards for teachers in the public schools throughout the United States are generally mandated by the individual states. Academic preparation programs for teachers are required to meet standards specified by the states before individual graduates can be offered professional teacher certification. The specific requirements for certification are dictated by the states in accordance with recommendations of various interest groups through lengthy processes of recommendation and review. Certification regulations are ultimately published and become law for the individual states.

Requirements for certification generally fall into the broad categories of general requirements, professional education requirements, and specific endorsement requirements. The category of general requirements usually embrac such items as minimum age, health standards, academic accomplishment, such as a baccalaureate degree, as well as general course requirements relating to a general education background, i.e., humanities, social sciences, laboratory sciences, health and physical education. Professional education requirements generally include rather molar areas such as courses in human growth and development, curriculum and instructional procedures and practical experience or student teaching. The last category of certification regulations is that related to the particular teaching area of the individual. In this category is found content requirements for specific teaching areas, e.g., science, mathematics, and social studies. Specific requirements relevant to particula geographical areas are not typically included in state certification regulati Rather, no distinction in state certification regulations is made between tho who wish to teach in urban areas as opposed to those who wish to teach in non

urban areas. While significant differences may indeed exist among various geographical areas within a state, differential kinds of preparation programs for teachers who will serve in differential areas of the state receive no attention.

The National Urban Education Conference of 1975 endeavored to definitivel qualify the term "urban." While no alternative term was suggested, certain indicators of "urbaness" appeared consistently. These indicators were various described as high population density areas with a heterogeneous mix of racial, ethnic, and economic groups as well as a confluence of sub-cultures with concomitant attitudes and values. That these indicators are clearly present in the largest cities in the United States cannot be denied.

If we acknowledge that state mandated professional preparation do not acknowledge the distinction between urban and non-urban areas, and if we further acknowledge that such a distinction is real, then an educational imperative arises which demands that alternative routes to professional teach preparation should be explored and given substance. Without the formulation of alternative preparatory schemes, we will continue to find teacher preparation programs addressed to such broad general concerns in education as to completely neglect the problems endemic to the urban areas. Again, the issue of ecological validity is paramount.

Rivlen and Gold have recently spoken to this discrepancy between preparation programs and needs of teachers in urban areas in their monograph, Teachers for Multicultural Education; "We once thought education had taken a giant step forward ... when it recognized that understanding the child was the essential prerequisite to teaching him. 'Teach the child not the subject' was an easily understood and winning slogan, but it is not enough. In a

sense, every classroom in the country is crowded because each pupil brings to class not only himself but also his family, his friends, and his cultural background, with its values and practices. To understand the child also means understanding his background." Rivlen and Gold proceed to indicate that the standard courses in educational psychology, child psychology, and correlative human development courses, while clearly necessary, are, nevertheless, not totally adequate. The extent to which teachers find themselves immersed in an environment characterized by vast differences in the cultural ethos of their students requires that the teacher have some preparation for successfully confronting that environment. The definite intent of Rivlen and Gold is to recommend courses in social psychology and sociology because, "Learning is a social as well as an individual process." It is the thesis of Rivlen and Gold that contemporary teacher preparation programs should not only expose future teachers to the multicultural aspects of our society and the various contributions of different cultural and ethnic groups, but also to train those future teachers to introduce instructional strategies into the classroom milieu which capitalize on these multicultural dimensions.

More concretely, AACTE has recently affirmed its support of the multicultural education missions by establishing the Commission on Multicultural Education. One charge of this commission was the planning of the recent leadership training institute on multicultural education. The state of Virginia, in its plan for equal opportunity in Virginia's Institution of Higher Education, has directed that a "Review of all teacher training programs in Virginia's state supported institutions of higher education" be conducted with "primary consideration to the quality and amount of training which teache receive to prepare them to teach minority group students with the greatest pos sible effectiveness."

Graduation requirements from colleges and universities tend to operate in a manner similiar to state certification requirements for teachers. The institution, given its philosophical predilections, places certain general requirements on the graduate, regardless of major, which it believes are important if it is to confer its degree on the individual. Major requirements are then added to those general requirements with a sufficient number of elective courses to allow the individual to meet the hour requirement for graduation. It is important to note, however, that in institutional graduation requirements as well as state certification requirements, the areas of interest to the institution or to the state are not left to chance, but are indeed requirements. If, then, we believe that the preparation of teachers for urban areas is important and distinct, then it only follows that we too should levy requirements. I would not suggest that we completely clutter an individuals academic experience with required courses but we must establish our priorities. To not raise the issue of requiring specific courses which in our minds are important in the academic preparation of a future teacher for an urban area is pedagogical negligence on our part. To fail to accept this ambitious task is to compromise our nations most critical asset, its human capital.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Assumptions

The research design of this project was based primarily on three assumptions. These assumptions are as follows: 1) While a definition of the term "urban" is yet to be adequately formulated, the largest cities in the United States indicate those qualities which are consistently regarded as urban. The Census Bureau recently published a list of those cities which have 100,000 people or more. All of these cities for the purposes of this study were assumed to be urban. 2) Those individuals who teach in urban areas may reflect certain areas of needed expertise which are different from those required of individuals who teach in non-urban areas. 3) Public school systems which exist in urban areas have made decisions concerning what teachers need in the way of urban preparation. Having been on the "firing line," as Norman Drachler stated last year, they are being held accountable and are initiating appropriate action.

Procedure

During the Summer of 1976, a questionnaire was mailed to the superintendents of schools in the one hundred fifty-seven largest cities in the United States. Each of these cities had a population of 100,000 or more. The survey was an open-ended questionnaire designed to determine a specific school system's requirements, recommendations, and needs in the area of preparation programs for their teachers. Two follow-up surveys were mailed to non-responde resulting in a yield of 97 respondents (63% return) by October of 1976.

The data resulting from the open-ended questions on the survey instrument were tallied and combined in frequency counts as appropriate.

RESULTS

The data resulting from this questionnaire are reported by individual question. There has been no attempt to cross-tabulate the data resulting from the individual questions since the questions are independent. It should also be mentioned that the survey questions were stated in the context of "courses." Although individuals were encouraged to respond in terms of competencies if that seemed to be more valuable, no respondent chose that option.

Question #1: The first question asked whether there were any particular kinds of courses which school systems require of their teachers prior to employment which are specifically related to their existence in an urban area. You will notice that the vast majority of respondents have no such requirement. Indeed, only 6 of the 97 respondents indicated that they place any such requirement on their teachers. These school systems are listed in Table 1 which includes a breakdown of the kinds of requirements they levy. You will notice of the 8 requirements specified, 6 are in the area of multicultural and urban education and 2 are in the area of reading.

Question #2: The second question asked if there were any courses which were highly recommended but not required of teachers prior to their employment which relate to the school system's existence in an urban environment. As Table 2 indicates, 36 school systems responded affirmatively. The total number of recommendations offered by these 36 school systems was 81. You have before you a breakdown of the major categories of those recommendations. Nineteen were in the area of multicultural education, 21 in the area of urban education and sociology, 12 in the area of reading, 6 in the area of urban internships, and 1 in the area of classroom management for a total of 59.

The other 22 recommendations were individualized and were not easily collapsed. A total of forty recommendations, you will note, were in the broad area of multicultural and urban education.

Question #3: The third question asked if there are any courses which the school system requires teachers to obtain within the first few years of their employment which relate to their existence in an urban environment. You will note on Table 3 only 9 school systems have any specific requirements of this nature. Again, since there are so few, they are listed for you in Table 3. The requirements of those responding sum to 13 and are listed also. You will note, again, that the multicultural education category contains the largest number of requirements.

Question #4: Next, we asked if there were any courses which the systems recommended that their teachers obtain within the first few years of their employment which relate to their existence in an urban environment. Table 4 reports that 24 school systems or 25% responded affirmatively with a total of 50 recommendations. Again, you will note multicultural education with 26 and reading with 6 are the largest categories. Again, there are many individual listings which could not be easily collapsed into major categories and were, therefore, not listed.

Question #5: Question five asked if the school system offers any in-service training program within the district which are designed to assist teachers in handling their responsibilities in an urban area. As Table 5 indicates, 60 school systems or 62% of the respondents replied in the affirmative. A total of 161 in-service programs were listed in response to this question. You will note the major categories listed. Again, multicultural education

exists in 49 different in-service programs, reading in 21, classroom management in 10, individualized instruction in 8, subject matter in-service programs in 8, and drug education in 3. These categories represent 99 of the 161 programs which were listed.

Question #6: Next, we asked the school system if they required their prospective teachers to have any specific kind of internship, practicum or student teaching which related to their existence in an urban environment. As you can see from Table 6, the number of school systems which have such a requirement is very small. Only 8 school systems or 8% of the respondents indicated they had such a requirement. However, it is also interesting to note that 21 school systems stated they preferred that prospective teachers have that kind of experience.

Question #7: The seventh question asked if the school system required their prospective teachers to have their student teaching experience in a racially integrated classroom. We felt that this question was not necessarily a duplication of the previous question and wanted to ask it more specifically. The data in Table 7 indicate there is some difference because 12 school systems responded that they did have such a requirement. However, the vast majority responded that they did not.

Question #8: The eighth question asked if school systems had any special requirements not enumerated previously which they place on teachers as a result ot their existence in an urban environment. Apparently, we had touched most of the bases because Table 8 reveals that only 9 school systems indicated that they had such requirements. Since there are only 9, they are listed here for you and contiguous to their listing is a brief explanation of the kind of

requirements which they declared. You will notice that Philadelphia requires a written and oral examination on urban problems; Lansing, Michigan and Lincoln, Nebraska have specific interviewing procedures which test attitudes of tolerance toward individual differences, and Camden, N. J. requires evidence of urban experience somewhere in the hiring process.

Question #9: Next, we asked if there are any recommendations which the school system would like to make to teacher training institutions that would help them better train teachers for work in an urban environment. Table 9 shows that 65 school systems or 67% of the respondents made a total of 123 recommendations. There was wide variability in those recommendations; however, some of the major ones are tabled for your perusal. Urban Internships accounted for 22 responses and 26 responses recommended more field experience prior to student teaching. Twenty made a recommendation in the area of urban education, and 5 in the area of classroom management. The others were individual responses and not easily collapsed into categories.

Question #10: Question ten asked if there were any educational problems which the school system perceived to be unique to urban school systems and non-existent in suburban or rural areas. This question was asked to determine if, in the point of view of the school systems, there are any differences between urban and non-urban areas and, moreover, as a check on the attitudes of our respondents. Table 10 indicates that 67 school systems or 69% of the respondents indicated that there are differences and they listed a total of 215 factors. A collapsing of these factors into categories revealed that 66 of those problems related to the multicultural environment present in the urban area, 13 related to student transciency, 11 related to the area of classroom management, and 11 embraced

in the area best described as poor parental support for school systems. The collapsed total of the 215 factors essayed was 101.

Question #11: The last question asked if there were any teacher training institutions which the school systems felt did a particularly good job of training teachers for the urban environment. As Table 11 indicates, 33 school systems delineated 50 institutions of higher learning. An inspection of these institutions reveal that very few received more than one vote. Indeed, only one institution, the University of Massachusetts Amherst, received three votes which incidentally, was the maximum number received by any institution. For those of you who may be interested in the institutions which were listed, I have reproduced the list for you in this table.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data resulting from this survey would indicate that urban school systems have yet to place specific requirements on their teachers which are a result of their existence in an urban area and their concomitant recognition of special needs for urban teachers. The data would indicate, however, that the school systems are not at all reluctant to make recommendations as to what their teachers need to teach in urban environments and, indeed, have responded themselves to those needs by offering a large number of in-service programs.

To the extent that individuals believe that colleges and universities cannot train teachers, and that it is more properly the responsibility of the school system on site to train the teacher, these data would indicate that school systems are reflecting that point of view when the area of urban education is considered. Such an observation may be entirely due to the fact that hi er education has abdicated its responsibility in the area of urban education, however.

The data also indicate there is a need, as recognized by the urban school systems in the United States, for teachers in those systems to have certain kin of experiences, attitudes, and possible competencies. Clearly, it is the belie of the school systems that individuals who teach in an urban area should have a knowledge of that urban area as it is represented in cultural differences and how those differences relate to the learning-teaching process and the classroom milieu.

Teacher training institutions should recognize the fact that school system are offering in-service programs to meet their needs. Furthermore, to the extent these in-service programs are different from the programs that the teacher

training institutions are currently offering to their students, pre-service programs should perhaps be reviewed. The obvious example would be consideration of courses in urban education, urban sociology, and multicultural education, to name only a few. Should these kinds of courses not exist in teacher training programs throughout the country, it would behoove those institutions who purport to train teachers for urban areas to consider not only offering such courses if they do not currently do so, but incorporating them into the existing curricula as requirements.

ARE THERE ANY PARTICULAR KINDS OF COURSES WHICH YOU REQUIRE YOUR TEACHERS TO HAVE, PRIOR TO EMPLOYMENT, WHICH RELATE SPECIFICALLY TO YOUR EXISTENCE IN AN URBAN AREA?

N = 97	YES = 6	NO = 91
	(6%)	(94%)

SCHOOL SYSTEMS

LANSING, MICH.	WASHINGTON, D.C.
LAS VEGAS, NEV.	ERIE, PA.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.	DES MOINES, IOWA

REQUIREMENTS: 8

MULTI-CULTURAL/URBAN ED.	6
READING	2
TOTAL	8

ARE THERE ANY COURSES WHICH YOU HIGHLY RECOMMEND BUT DO NOT REQUIRE YOUR TEACHERS TO HAVE, PRIOR TO THEIR EMPLOYMENT WITH YOU, WHICH RELATE TO YOUR EXISTENCE IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT?

N = 97	YES = 36 (37%)	NO = 61 (63%)

RECOMMENDATIONS 81

MULTI-CULTURAL ED.	19	40
URBAN ED./SOC.	21	
READING	12	
URBAN INTERNSHIPS	6	
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	1	
TOTAL	59	

QUESTION #2

ARE THERE ANY COURSES WHICH YOU REQUIRE YOUR TEACHERS TO OBTAIN WITHIN THE FIRST FEW YEARS OF THEIR EMPLOYMENT WITH YOU WHICH RELATE TO YOUR EXISTENCE IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT?

N = 97	YES = 9	NO = 88
	(9%)	(91%)

SCHOOL SYSTEMS

MIAMI, FLA.
MADISON, WIS.
CLEARWATER, ALA.
LANSING, MICH.
OMAHA, NEB.
WASHINGTON, D.C.
FLINT, MICH.
RALEIGH, N.C.
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

REQUIREMENTS 13

MULTI-CULTURAL ED.	5
READING	3
NON-SPECIFIC	5
TOTAL	13

ARE THERE ANY COURSES WHICH YOU RECOMMEND YOUR TEACHERS OBTAIN WITHIN THE FIRST FEW YEARS OF THEIR EMPLOYMENT WITH YOU WHICH RELATE TO YOUR EXISTENCE IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT?

N = 97	YES = 24 (25%)	NO = 73 (75%)

RECOMMENDATIONS 50

MULTI-CULTURAL ED.	26
READING	6
URBAN INTERNSHIPS	1
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	1
TOTAL	34

QUESTION #4

DO YOU OFFER ANY IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS WHICH ARE DESIGNED TO ASSIST TEACHERS IN HANDLING THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES IN AN URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM?

N = 97	YES = 60 (62%)	NO = 37 (38%)

PROGRAMS = 161

MULTI-CULTURAL ED.	49
READING	21
CLASSROOM MGT.	10
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTR.	8
DRUG ED.	3
SUBJECT MATTER	8
TOTAL	99

QUESTION #5

DO YOU REQUIRE THAT PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS HAVE ANY SPECIFIC KIND OF INTERNSHIP, PRACTICUM, OR STUDENT TEACHING WHICH RELATES TO YOUR EXISTENCE IN AN URBAN AREA?

N = 97	YES = 8	NO = 89
	(8%)	(92%)

PREFERRED 21

QUESTION #6

DO YOU REQUIRE YOUR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS TO HAVE THEIR STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN A RACIALLY INTEGRATED CLASSROOM?

N = 97	YES = 12	NO = 86
	(12%)	(88%)

QUESTION #7

DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS, OF ANY NATURE, NOT ENUMERATED ABOVE, WHICH YOU PLACE ON YOUR TEACHERS AS A RESULT OF YOUR EXISTENCE IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT?

N = 97	YES = 9 (9%)	NO = 88 (91%)

School Systems

PHILADELPHIA, PA.:	WRITTEN AND ORAL EXAM ON URBAN PROBLEMS.
CLEARWATER, ALA.:	TESTS ON TEACHING OF MATH AND READING.
LANSING, MICH.:	ATTITUDES OF TOLERENCE TOWARD INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES.
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.:	BI-LINGUAL ABILITY IN BI-LINGUAL SCHOOLS.
LINCOLN, NEB.:	ATTITUDES OF TOLERENCE TOWARD INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES.
BUFFALO, N.Y.:	RESIDENCY.
CINCINATTI, OHIO:	PROFESSIONAL COMMITTMENT.
PORTSMOUTH, VA.:	COPING ABILITY.
CAMDEN, N.J.:	SOME EVIDENCE OF URBAN EXPERIENCE.

ARE THERE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE TO TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS THAT WOULD HELP THEM BETTER TRAIN TEACHERS FOR WORK IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT?

N = 97	YES = 65 (67%)	NO = 32 (33%)

RECOMMENDATIONS 123

URBAN INTERNSHIPS	22
URBAN ED.	20
MORE FIELD EXPERIENCE	26
CLASSROOM MGT.	5
TOTAL	73

QUESTION #9

PLEASE LIST THOSE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS WHICH YOU PERCEIVE TO BE UNIQUE TO URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND NON-EXISTENT IN SUBURBAN OR RURAL SYSTEMS.

N = 97	YES = 67 (69%)	NO = 30 (31%)

PROBLEMS 215

MULTI-CULTURAL	66
STUDENT TRANSCIENCY	13
CLASSROOM MGT.	11
LESS PARENTAL SUPPORT	11
TOTAL	101

QUESTION #10

ARE THERE ANY TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS WHICH IN YOUR OPINION SPEAK PARTICULARLY TO THE NEEDS OF URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS?

N = 97	YES = 33 (34%)	NO = 64 (66%)

INSTITUTIONS 40

HARRIS TEACHERS COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIV.
UNIV. OF CINCINATTI
MIAMI UNIV.,(OXFORD, OHIO)
OHIO STATE UNIV.
STATE UNIV. COLLEGE AT BUFFALO
SAN JOSE ST. UNIV.
SAN FRANCISCO ST. UNIV.
UNIV. OF UTAH
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIV.
WEBER COLLEGE
UTAH ST. UNIV.
WESTMINSTER
WAYNE ST. UNIV.
TEMPLE UNIV.
FLORIDA ST. UNIV.(CUTE PROGRAM)
MICHIGAN ST. UNIV.
INDIANA UNIV.
EVANSVILLE COLLEGE
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV.
UNIV. OF MASSACHUSSETTES
KEAN COLLEGE OF N.J.
NEW YORK UNIV.
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN
UNIV. OF HOUSTON
WICHITA ST. UNIV.
NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATIO
NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS ST. UN
CHICAGO STATE UNIV.
CREIGHTON UNIV.
D. C. TEACHERS COLLEGE
FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE
WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITU
BANK STREET
BALL STATE
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT ST. COL
CENTRAL CONNECTICUT ST. COLL
FAIRFIELD UNIV.

BELOW ARE LISTED THE CITIES WHICH WERE USED TO DEVELOP THIS SURVEY. X INDICATES THOSE WHICH RESPONDED.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
X CHICAGO, ILL.
X LOS ANGELES, CALF.
X SAN DIEGO, CALF.
X SAN FRANCISCO, CALF.
SAN JOSE, CALF.
X LONG BEACH, CALF.
OAKLAND, CALF.
X SACRAMENTO, CALF.
ANAHEIM, CALF.
FRESNO, CALF.
SANTA ANA, CALF.
X HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALF.
X TORRANCE, CALF.
GLENDALE, CALF.
X GARDEN GROVE, CALF.
X FREMONT, CALF.
STOCKTON, CALF.
BERKELEY, CALF.
X SAN BERNARDINO, CALF.
PASADENA, CALF.
X SUNNY VALE, CALF.
X PHILADELPHIA, PA.
X PITTSBURGH, PA.
X ERIE, PA.
X ALLAN TOWN, PA.

DETROIT, MICH.
GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.
X FLINT, MICH.
WARREN, MICH.
X LANSING, MICH.
X LIVONIA, MICH.
ANN ARBOR, MICH.
X DEARBORN, MICH.
X HOUSTON, TX.
DALLAS, TX.
X SAN ANTONIO, TX.
X FORT WORTH, TX.
X EL PASO, TX.
AUSTIN, TX.
X CORPUS CHRISTI, TX.
X LUBBOCK, TX.
AMARILLO, TX.
BEAUMONT, TX.
X ARLINGTON, TX.
X IRVING, TX.
GARLAND, TX.
X BALTIMORE MD.
X INIANAPOLIS, IND.
FORT WAYNE, IND.
GARY, IND.
EVANSVILLE, IND.

X SOUTH BEND, IND.
X HAMMOND, IND.
X WASHINGTON, D.C.
X CHARLOTTE, N.C
X GREENSBORO, N.C.
X WINSTON-SALEM, N.C
X RALEIGH, N.C.
X DURHAM, N.C.
X NORFOLK, VA.
X RICHMOND, VA.
X VA. BEACH, VA.
X NEWPORT NEWS, VA.
X HAMPTON, VA.
X PORTSMOUTH, VA.
ALEXANDRIA, VA.
SEATTLE, WASH.
X SPOKANE, WASH.
TACOMA, WASH.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.
X MADISON, WIS.
X CLEVELAND, OHIO
COLUMBUS, OHIO
X CINCINNATI, OHIO
X TOLEDO, OHIO
X AKRON, OHIO
DAYTON, OHIO

Youngstown, Ohio
X Canton, Ohio
X Parma, Ohio
Memphis, Tenn.
Nashville, Tenn.
X Knoxville, Tenn.
X Chattanooga, Tenn.
Little Rock, Ark.
X Phoenix, Ariz.
X Tucson, Ariz.
Boston, Mass.
X Worchester, Mass.
Springfield, Mass.
New Orleans, La.
X Baton Rouge, La.
X Shreveport, La.
X St. Louis, Mo.
X Kansas City, Mo.
X Springfield, Mo.
Independence, Mo.
X Jacksonville, Fla.
X Miami, Fla.
Clearwater, Fla.
Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.
Orlando, Fla.
Denver, Co.
Colorado Springs, Co.
Lakewood, Co.
X Pueblo, Co.

x Atlanta, Ga.
X Columbus, Ga.
X Macon, Ga.
X Savannah, Ga.
X Buffalo, N.Y.
Rochester, N.Y.
X Yonkers, N.Y.
Syracuse, N.Y.
Minneapolis, Minn.
St. Paul, Minn.
Portland, Ore.
X Omaha, Neb.
Oklahoma City, Okla.
X Newark, N.J.
Jersey City, N.J.
Patterson, N.J.
X Elizabeth, N.J.
Trenton, N.J.
X Camden, N.J.
X Lexington, Ky.
Tulsa, Okla.
Louisville, Ky.
Tampa, Fla.
Riverside, Calf.
Albany, N.Y.
X Birmingham, Ala.
Mobile, Ala.
Montgomery, Ala.
X Huntsville, Ala.

Albuquerque, N.M.
X Wichita, Kan.
X Kansas City, Kan.
X Des Moines, Iowa
X Providence, R.I.
X Salt Lake City, Utah
X Jackson, Miss.
X Lincoln, Neb.
Hartford, Conn.
Bridgeport, Conn.
X New Haven, Conn.
Waterbury, Conn.
X Stamford, Conn.
X Las Vegas, Nev.
Rockford, Ill.
Topeka, Kan.
X Peoria, Ill.
X Columbia, S.C.
X Cedar Rapids, Iowa

References

Rivlin, H. N. & Gold, M. J. Teachers for multicultural education Multicultural Component of the Fordham University Teacher Corps, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York, New York. 1-12.

Certification Regulations for Teachers. Commonwealth of Virginia State Board of Education. Richmond, Virginia. 1-28.